

**New York Tribune**  
First to Last—the Truth—News—Editorials  
—Advertisements—  
Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulation

FRIDAY, MARCH 21, 1919

Owned and published daily by New York Tribune Inc., a New York Corporation. Office: 120 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: 1000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—By Mail, including Postage:  
In the United States and Canada:  
Daily and Sunday.....\$10.00  
Daily only.....\$8.00  
Sunday only.....\$2.00  
Foreign Rates:  
Daily and Sunday.....\$12.00  
Daily only.....\$10.00  
Sunday only.....\$2.50

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter

**GUARANTEE**  
You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—If dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape. No hassling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

MEMBER OF THE ASSOCIATED PRESS

The Associated Press is exclusively entitled to the use for publication of all news dispatches received by it or otherwise credited to this paper and also the local news of spontaneous origin published herein.

All rights of reproduction of all other matter herein are also reserved.

**Clearing the Air**

The light shining out of Boston, arising from the sparks of blades when a Cabot met a Lowell, should illumine the dark places where misrepresentation has recently flourished.

The President, at last accounts, still held that the constitutional convention has adjourned and was busy framing new maledictions to hurl at profane amenders. Less drastic, Mr. Taft intimates that he would have the door stay open for a few days more—until the tentative draft is converted into a final decree. President Lowell had too much respect for the truth and himself to assert that to oppose the covenant is to show hostility to the league of peace idea; he had too much regard for candor and for his own reputation to deny the need of amendments.

Harvard's head could not exactly see himself supporting either of these propositions. Perhaps he feared his undergraduates would laugh if he defended such absurdities.

The debate may be deemed rid of confusing nonsense. The attempt to capitalize in a partisan way the sentiment in favor of some form of international concert for permanent peace has failed. Two weeks' exposure to the air crumbled it. It had no more vitality than the straddling proposal in 1896, when the silver issue was up, to limit the platform to the declaration, "We favor the money of the Constitution."

The public is to hear little more of the tricky question: "Don't you favor peace?" The proponents of the covenant must meet its opponents on the issues involved. Definite criticisms have been made. The sufficiency of some of these President Lowell admits—that the document is vague and that it is in need of material amendment.

But there are others. It is charged that the covenant is more calculated to promote war than to promote peace, and the wrangling and distrust of our allies so far engendered, supports the accusation; that sovereignty is surrendered with nothing, or practically nothing in return; that, as to this text being clear, this country guarantees the integrity of every existent nation; that the Monroe Doctrine is abandoned, and no adequate safeguard erected against foreign intrusion in our domestic affairs. Here are questions which cannot longer be dodged.

But more important than what the league does is what it fails to do. It does not meet the great hope of the world. A re-write of The Hague convention, it would probably be of no greater benefit than the instrument of desuetude it would replace. It has already introduced disharmony among the peace makers who must be the peace defenders. It bars the way to fuller plans for peace. It delays bringing the boys home. These issues are also undodgeable.

Equally fatal, although for other reasons, is the way the covenant has been prepared. The advice of the Senate not having been asked, by a parliamentary trick it is proposed to deny its right to withhold consent. This makes ratification practically impossible. The Senate must not allow a revolution which will give to a President, with respect to foreign affairs, such autocratic powers. A President cannot be allowed to make peace at will and on what terms he pleases. This would end here parliamentary control over war and peace.

So far as Senator Lodge has authority to speak, he announces the Senate is ready to do business. If the President wishes to consult it, the door of approach is wide open. It will prepare its amendments if given a chance. It is not obstructionist, and a President who has asked for no advice cannot assume it has no plan.

Thus associated with problems relating to the contents of the covenant is the one of whether a great department of the government is to be practically suppressed.

**The Bachelor Problem**

The problem of the bachelor is no longer a joke in Europe, with its increased disparity of men. In Great Britain are a million and a half women now automatically barred from marriage through lack of men to go round.

What shall be done? What penalty must the bachelor pay? Now and then some one raises a defiant voice for the plan of Solomon and the late Brigham Young.

But the consensus of opinion appears

to be to extinguish masculine singleness by taxes and nothing more. The ancient world is rich in precedents. In Sparta, for example, unmarried men could not witness the athletic exercises of the maidens, and in the winter non-Benedicks were compelled to march disrobed about the market place, singing a song in condemnation of their slacker attitude toward Sparta. Athens, as might be expected, was more refined in its punishment, but even there the unmarried man was under the shadow of official and popular disapproval. Rome, too, passed laws penalizing this class of citizens. From 1695 to 1706 there was a law in effect in England imposing a tax on bachelors, ranging from 12 pounds 10 shillings for a duke to one shilling for a "common" person. Later unmarried men were compelled to pay a special tax for the privilege of employing servants.

These penalties, while frankly imposed for the "offence" of being a bachelor, do not differ in principle from the present practice, for bachelors are extra-taxed at present, both in England and the United States. In proof of this one has only to refer to the clause in the income tax law which gives the married man double the exemption allowed the unmarried, with an additional exemption for children.

**A Victory for Free Labor**

The Commission on International Labor Legislation closed its labor discussion at Paris by accepting the American contention that each country should settle its internal labor problems without invoking the aid of the league of nations.

Congratulations to clear-headed and stout-hearted Samuel Gompers! This bulwark against Bolshevism has not fallen. This upholder of the principle that free men of labor shall come together in free unions lowers not his arm. He knows the practices of the philosophy he opposes, and, understanding it fully, he opposes it.

No autocrat for him, for he knows enough history to know autocracy means slavery. Other peoples may do as they like, but he has confidence enough in himself and his co-workers to feel they are intelligent enough and powerful enough to take care of their own. He is not aware of anything European labor, with all the theorizing of its parlorites, has done for American labor. The more the revolutionaries agitate the greater the number who seek to escape to America. This fact has significance. When the gates of Ellis Island swing outward rather than inward he may deem European methods better, but not now. He is for liberty, a full measure of democratic liberty, as the greatest asset labor possesses, and beneath the blows of his common sense the artificial structures of theorizing Bolsheviks quickly fall.

**When Is Beer Intoxicating?**

The Lager Beer Brewers' Board of Trade of this city has decided to resume the brewing of beer containing 2.75 per cent of alcohol by weight and 3.3 per cent by volume. It holds that beer of this strength is not an intoxicating liquor.

The United States Internal Revenue Bureau has ruled that beer containing one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol comes under the ban of the war prohibition act. The courts will now have to decide where the twilight zone between intoxicating beer and non-intoxicating beer starts and finishes.

Many court decisions impinge on the present dispute. These show marked divergences of opinion, some giving a strict and the other a rather broad interpretation of the statutes dealing with beer as an intoxicant. Here are some of the first class:

*Estes v. State*, 166 Pacific (Okla. Cr. App.) 77.

Intoxicating liquor, as used in prohibitory liquor statutes, denotes an alcoholic liquor, and must contain more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol, or be able to intoxicate a human being.

*State v. Colvin*, 137 Ia. 632.

Under Code Section 2382, declaring that the term "intoxicating liquor" shall be construed to mean alcohol and all intoxicating liquors whatever, evidence is not admissible, on a prosecution for keeping a liquor nuisance, that a liquor sold as a beverage containing from 1 to 2 per cent of alcohol is not intoxicating.

*State v. Fargo Bottling Works*, 124 N. W. (N. D.) 387.

Under Laws 1919, p. 277, c. 187, including a definition of intoxicating liquors as a beverage retaining the alcoholic principle as a distinctive force, a defendant having sold liquor labelled "Purity Malt," commonly sold in the state as a substitute for beer, and containing 1 75-100 per cent of alcohol by volume and 1 40-100 per cent of alcohol by weight, was guilty of a violation of the prohibitory law.

*Feddern v. State*, 79 Neb. 651.

The word "beer" without restriction or qualification denotes an intoxicating malt liquor, and is within the meaning of the words "intoxicating liquor" as used throughout the statute.

*State v. Gamna*, 129 S. W. 734 (Mo. App.).

Under Laws 1891, p. 128, Section 26, defining the term "intoxicating liquors" to mean fermented, vinous and spirituous liquors, or any composition of which fermented, vinous or spirituous liquor is a part, a beverage containing alcohol in any quantity is an intoxicating liquor, without regard to the quantity of alcohol present.

The following decisions fall in the second class:

*Heints v. La Page*, 100 Me. 542.

Any liquor containing alcohol which is based on such other ingredients or by reason of the absence of certain ingredients, so that it may be drunk by an ordinary person as a beverage, and in such quantities as to produce intoxication, is "intoxicating liquor."

*Commonwealth v. Louisville & N. R. Co.*, 140 Ky. 21.

"Intoxicating liquors" as used in Kentucky Statutes, Section 2569a, and other local option legislation, means spirituous, vinous or malt liquors, by whatever name called, that contain alcohol, and are intended to

be or may be used as a beverage, and when so used will intoxicate.

*City of Topeka v. Zuffall* (Kansas Supreme Court).

In a prosecution for a violation of a city ordinance for selling a certain fluid called "peach cider" on the ground that this was an intoxicating beverage, the sale of which was forbidden by the ordinance, it was held that the court erred in instructing the jury, as a matter of law, that if such beverage contained 6 per cent of alcohol it was an intoxicating beverage within the meaning of the ordinance. The question as to whether such beverage is intoxicating is a question of fact to be determined by the jury under proper instructions.

*Blatch v. Rohrvach*, 116 N. Y. 150.

An action brought by a widow whose husband committed suicide while intoxicated. The proof showed that Blatz drank two or three glasses of beer at the defendant's saloon and the court charged the jury that he drank intoxicating liquors. The upper court held that this charge was in error in that the term "beer," in the absence of evidence as to its quality and effect, does not necessarily mean an intoxicating liquor. The term "beer" includes both intoxicating and non-intoxicating liquors, said the court. It added: "It plainly was not the intention of the Legislature to prohibit the sale of the numerous kinds of mild drink sold under the name of beer, and I think it may be affirmed that the term, as now used, is generally understood to refer to 'lager.'"

It is manifest that the present beer "twilight zone" is far from being legally charted.

**"Under Favorable Conditions"**

Dr. von Kuehlmann, the former "Liberal" Foreign Minister of Germany, says that "under favorable conditions the Germans will be in Paris before 1925."

What would be the favorable conditions which von Kuehlmann anticipates? A peace which leaves the nations now allied more or less at odds with one another. German diplomacy may not be intelligent in the highest sense, but it is often skilful up to a certain point, and sowing distrust between America and England, or America and France, let us say, would be well within its powers. Nor would it be safe to rely on a league of nations as the infallible antidote for this poison. Its possibilities as a source of discord have already become obvious.

A closer and closer union of the free and faith keeping nations furnishes the only reasonable assurance against the appearance of the "favorable conditions" von Kuehlmann longs for. Here is a centre of peace. There is none other.

Germany, even though her leaders so wished, of which there is no evidence, cannot be made over in a few days. The war's event has temporarily modified the brutal belligerent ardor of the Teutons, but let a chance of success show itself, and Thor will again shoulder his hammer to smash Gothic cathedrals.

Ready enough to join Germany is Russia, now ruled by Bolsheviks, who make no secret of a purpose to smash democracy if they can. In Southern Europe are new nations whose spirit and policy cannot be foreseen, and who may turn on the nations creating them, even as Bulgaria turned on Russia. Further afield are the awakening millions of Asia, who, under Prussian drillmasters, may become most formidable in power.

But one peak of peace rises from the waters. It is a union among the democratic peoples. Call it league, call it coalition, or call it alliance (names do not matter), the essential thing is to stay together. As a corollary it is necessary to allow something to the views of our present and future friends.

Those who essay the direction of our national policy are blind. They wish for permanent peace, but they do not know the way. They are bitten now with the same intellectual and moral insufficiency which afflicted them when they prolonged the war by opposing America's entry and by preventing preparedness. Such are not competent to manage the affairs with which they are entrusted. That they mean well is of no consequence. An idealist is valueless who does not contribute to the realization of his ideal.

**Peace First**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: What's all this gab about a league of nations for, anyhow? Haven't we got one already? Haven't the Central Powers got one, or rather didn't they have one until "our league" busted it?

What in thunder good is a league of nations on paper unless they all sign up? Peace first! Then a "committee of the whole world."

I came down to see some of my boy's comrades. He isn't here. He is in the military cemetery at Bouy because he enlisted in "our league."

If they don't all "come in" there won't be much to it. And I am no mind reader, either.

PEACE FIRST.

New York, March 17, 1919.

**Aid for Mr. Glass**

(From The Philadelphia Inquirer).

With a salary of \$100,000 we shall expect Mr. McAdoo to come across splendidly in order to help out his successor with that Victory Loan.

**The Conning Tower**

From: Horace  
To: Phyllis  
Subject: Invitation  
Book IV, Ode 11.

"Est mihi nomen superantia animus—"  
Phyllis, I've a jar of wine,  
(Alban, B. C. 49),  
Parsley wreaths, and, for your tresses,  
Ivy that your beauty blesses.

Shines my house with silverware;  
Frontage decks the altar stair—  
Sacred vervain, a device  
For a lambkin's sacrifice.

Up and down the household stairs  
What a festival prepares!  
Everybody's superintending—  
See the sooty smoke ascending!

What, you ask me, is the date  
Of the day we celebrate?  
13th April, month of Venus—  
Birthday of my boss, Maecenas.

Let me, Phyllis, say a word  
Touching Telephus, a bird  
Ranking far too high above you;  
(And the loofer doesn't love you).

Lessons, Phyllis, may be learned  
From Phaeton—how he was burned!  
And recall Bellerophon was  
One equestrian who thrown was.

Phyllis, of my loves the last,  
My philandering days are past.  
Sing you, in your clear contralto,  
Songs I write for the rialto.

Regardless of the action of Yale and Princeton, this Triforce of Tish will continue to make sight reading of Latin and Greek an entrance requirement.

**The Inquiring Colyumist**

(With bows to The Globe)

Every Day He Asks Five Persons,  
Carefully Picked, a Question

**Today's Question**

Do you think this is a good world?  
**Where Asked**  
154 Nassau Street, New York.

**The Answers**

1. Woodman Morrison, 154 Nassau Street: "I don't. I think it's one hell of a rotten world."

2. Harriette Underhill, Hotel Grenoble: "I don't. I think it's a damned rotten world."

3. Charlotte Ornstein, Jamaica: "Sometimes. To-day I like it."

4. W. J. Masters, 29 South 10th Street, Newark, N. J.: "I think it's a hell of a world."

5. George T. Hughes, City Editor, The Globe, 75 Day Street: "Yes. Finest world I ever lived in."

**Painters**

A beer with 2.75 per cent alcohol deserves a 4% collar, at most.

Considering again the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, G. O. A. writes: "I have just received notices requesting payment of two premiums already paid. And in the same envelope was a printed slip, asking me to disregard the notices if I have already paid them! If they don't know now, will they ever know? I have receipts from them for every payment I have made, but I find that they have never deposited for collection a single check that I have sent them. No wonder they need money. I object to the free usage of the term 'one thousand dollars.' I don't consider two hundred and forty monthly payments of \$6.75 the same thing as one thousand dollars. It is worth not over \$700 to \$800 to me. Now that the war is over, I think I am entitled to truth rather than fiction in government money matters. They can have my back pay."

**"Elementary, My Dear Watson, Elementary"**

Policeman Patrick J. Cavanaugh, of the 118th Precinct, Richmond Hall, L. I., made the arrest after Dr. Wilkins, shorn of his whiskers, had been pointed out by a reporter of The Herald—The Herald.

He was first noticed, as he paced nervously up and down the platform in front of the gates leading to the 8:10 o'clock train for Mineola, by Richard Conover, a reporter for The New York Herald—The Sun.

He was clean-shaven, having dispensed with his whiskers, but was recognized by the detectives, who had been watching the station throughout the day on a tip he was to arrive in town—The Morning Telegraph.

About 8 o'clock a reporter who had waited for a later train saw a man coming through the gates who resembled closely the descriptions sent out by the police, although he was smooth shaven—The Times.

An unidentified citizen then approached Cavanaugh and asked him if he didn't think the man was Dr. Wilkins. Cavanaugh said it looked like him and instructed the man to take an adjoining booth, as he saw Wilkins hurry into a telephone booth—The Tribune.

A citizen, who gave the name of Richard Conover, walked up and, pointing to an old man limping across the room, asked: "Doesn't that look like Dr. Wilkins?"—The World.

Policeman Patrick J. Cavanaugh, of the Richmond Hall Station, was waiting for the 8:10 Long Island train to that suburb when a man in a dark overcoat, whose name he did not obtain, approached him.

"Look at that man. Isn't that a lot like Dr. Wilkins?" asked the citizen—The American.

It should have been easy to spot Dr. Wilkins. A man who just has shaved off his mustache is self-conscious; but the self-consciousness of a man who just has jettisoned his mutton-chops must be enormous.

"Rough Peace Draft Likely," headlines the Globe. "Even that," ventures T., "is preferable to a slippery one."

The esteemed Washington Post records the singing in Washington, of Reginald Warrenrath.

Winter unconditionally surrendered this morning, and the California climate hounds who have regarded samples of the Eastern, or perfect, winter refuse to be interviewed.

Hail, even gentler spring! Even more ethereal mildness, come!

F. P. A.



**American Art To Be Shown in Paris**

A List of the Artists Invited to the Luxembourg

**ANNOUNCEMENT** was made some weeks ago of the invitation issued in the name of the French government for an exhibition of American works of art to be held in the Luxembourg Museum. Mr. William A. Coffin, the artist chosen as president of the committee organized to develop the project in this country, has now made a statement of the arrangements completed by himself and his associates. The exhibition is scheduled to open as early as possible in the month of May. It consists of present-day painting and sculpture, but Mr. Coffin states that a show of retrospective character may be held in Paris when the return exhibition of French art is brought to this country next year. The hope is even held out that there may be a yearly interchange of art exhibitions between the two nations.

The collection now proceeding to the Luxembourg has been made up by invitation, the choice of the artists represented having been made by each of the twelve painters on the committee naming individuals in turn until the limit was reached. To these were added one work by each of the members of the committee. Each work was selected by two members delegated by the executive board consulting with the artist invited. The total of paintings is 125. When an artist could not accept the invitation the member named him to choose another to take his place. The three sculptors on the committee made up their lists in conferences apart from the deliberations of the painters. The painters did not vote on sculptors or the sculptors on painters. The total number of pieces of sculpture is twenty-four. Finally, the entire collection when assembled was passed in review before the full committee and was approved by common consent. A committee of three American artists in Paris will select works by Americans residing in France and England, or who are there at the present time. John S. Sargent, J. J. Shannon and W. Elmer Schofield, in England; W. T. Darnett, Walter Gav, F. K. Frieseke, Janet Scudder and others, in France, will thus probably be represented.

Efforts have been made to make the exhibition varied in its illustration of artistic purpose, temperament, point of view and technical practice. Many artists of reputation are not represented because of the limited size of the collection. Prominent artists in other localities than New York and vicinity have been included so as to secure as representative an ensemble as possible. If some compromises have been made, many difficulties have also been surmounted. The list of those represented follows:

**PAINTERS**

Wayman Adams  
Robert Anderson  
Frederic C. Bartlett  
Gilford Beal  
Reynolds Beal  
Rebecca Beal  
George Bellows  
Frank W. Benson  
John E. Bingham  
Louis Bouché  
Sam Bohm  
Robert B. Brundage  
Hugh H. Breckinridge  
Roy Brown  
Arthur C. Bruch  
H. Paul Burlin  
Byron Burroughs  
Howard Russell Butler  
Arthur B. Carles  
Emil Carlsen  
John E. Carlson  
John E. Carver  
Charles S. Chapman  
William A. Coffin  
Glenn O. Coleman  
Glen Campbell Cooper  
Paul Conover  
William L. Cowdrey  
Kenyon Cox  
Bruce Crane  
Arthur C. Crockett  
Charles C. Curran  
Andrew Cassin  
Randall Davey  
Charles H. Davis  
Joseph de Camp  
Arthur M. Dewey  
Edmund W. Dickinson  
Paul Dougherty  
Frank V. Du Mond  
Ben Fether  
Kenneth Frazier  
Maurice Fromkes  
William Glackens  
Walter Griffin  
Albert R. Groll  
Victor Higgins  
John Elvett Grover  
Bernard Gussow  
Gardner Hale  
Philip L. Hale  
Samuel Halpert  
John M. Hare Hamilton  
Blige Harrison  
Clara Hassam  
Charles W. Hawthorne  
Robert Henri  
Eugene Hignia  
Victor Horta  
Charles Hopkins  
William H. Howe  
Erle Hudson  
John C. Johansen  
Francis C. Jones  
H. Bolton Jones  
Julia Kelly  
Rockwell Kent  
Edmund A. Kramer  
Leon Krull  
Max Kuehne  
Charles Lawson  
W. L. Lathrop  
Haley Lever  
John E. Little  
De Witt M. Lockman  
George Lusk  
Jeffery L. Mahee  
M. Jean Mene  
Alfred H. Maurer  
Kenneth H. Miller  
Richard S. Miller  
F. Luis Mora  
Jerome Myers  
Robert Nichols  
Violet Oakley  
George F. O'Neil  
Walter L. Palmer  
William M. Paxton  
Joseph P. Pearson, jr.  
Van Dearing Perrine  
Maurice Prendergast  
Grace Rayvin  
Edward W. Redfield  
Lieutenant Henry Reed  
Gertrude U. S. N. R. F.  
William R. Riechel  
William S. Robinson  
Edward R. Rook  
Charles R. Rowen  
Ernest T. Rosen  
Chauncey F. Ryder  
Leopold Seyffert  
Charles Sheeler  
Everett Shinn  
John Sloan  
William T. Spedley  
Eugene Speicher  
Robert S. Sweeney  
Carl Sprinchorn  
Modest Stein  
Joseph Stella  
Maurice Sterne  
Albert Stern  
Gardner Symons  
Edmund C. Tarbell  
Abbott H. Thayer  
Charles H. Turner  
Walter Ufer  
Robert W. Van Borswick  
Douglas Volk  
Horatio Walker  
Harry W. Watrous  
Max Weber  
J. Alden Weir  
Irving R. Wilder  
F. Ballard Williams  
Charles H. Woodbury  
William Zorach



**The Price of Bolshevism**

By Stanley Frost  
Who Reported the Overman Committee Hearings for The Tribune

WASHINGTON, March 20.—Out of the long-drawn Overman committee hearings on the subject of Bolshevism there developed a practical agreement, even among the pro-Bolshevik witnesses, as to the FACTS in Russia.

Strip off the softening words used by the defenders of the Soviets, strip off the explanations and the apologies and the psychological, metaphysical, sociological fog in which they enveloped their testimony, and there will be left, on their own evidence, substantially all the things charged by their bitterest opponents.

They will deny it, of course, and yet it is true.

**Those Who See Not**

Some, with self-blinded eyes, testified by faith—a faith like that of the pagan mothers who threw their babies into the belching furnace of Moloch.

Some who had left Russia months before the Red Terror began made general denials on principle.

All quarrelled with the accusers on the ground that there had been exaggeration. But creeping in through all their faith and all their bickerings were the same facts.

One or two of the mentally honest pro-Bolsheviks consciously admitted the facts, but argued the question of value. They thought the revolution was worth the bloodshed. In some way bloodshed did not seem a very serious thing to them. Their testimony was full of remarks about the "usual events" [they avoid the word murders] of civil war and revolution. They spoke of the smallness of the bourgeoisie class, and tried to give the impression that this class alone suffered, though when pinned down they admitted that the Bolsheviks define "bourgeois" to include far more than the 7 per cent of their defensive statistics.

**Call It a "Holy" Thing**

Always they ignored or denied the rule of terror, even insisting that terror cannot rule so large a country, though they had but a few moments before been declaiming about the centuries of terrorism under the Czar. And, finally, they would come back to the impregnable catchword of "self-determination" and declare that "Russia wants it."

But, whether the horrors in their mind were great or small, the revolution was something sacred, worthy of almost any suffering and sacrifice, especially if the suffering be inflicted on those who have risen above the common level. They held that there is unique virtue in lowliness.

There seems a real faith—almost a religion—in this worship of revolution as such, a faith based on sympathy with certain self-chosen kinds of suffering and a desire for a better world. It is the faith to believe that in some vague way a better time is coming out of the bloody welter in Russia. It cannot be explained except by the will to believe.

There is, too, the creed of good intentions.

**Not Deporting Negroes**

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Articles which have appeared in various newspapers, including The Tribune, relative to the so-called deportation of negro workers from Coatesville, have placed this city in a wrong light before the public.

The deportation which has been mentioned in some of the newspapers included whites as well as blacks. The men who were ordered from the city by the Mayor were of the wandering class—men who had formerly been employed elsewhere and simply came into our city as they were going from place to place. When they sought lodging at police headquarters it was furnished them, but they were informed the next morning that they must leave for home, as it is not the desire of the community to increase its number of idle men.

In addition to these men who were ordered, and rightly ordered, we believe, to leave the city, there were a number of undesirable, both black and white, caught in the dragnet of the state and mild police, following the start of what promised to be a reign of terror in the outlying districts of our city.

These are the facts in the case. Coatesville is not deporting men who were brought here and given employment in the mills.

COATESVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.

C. H. HEINTZELMAN, Secretary.

Coatesville, Penn., March 17, 1919.